

FOOD FOR THE HUNGRY INTERNATIONAL

P.L. 480 TITLE II INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM “*IMPROVING FOOD SECURITY PROGRAMMING AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT*”

SCOPE OF WORK FOR MID-TERM REVIEW

Submitted to USAID/FFP/COTR on 03 October 2000

**FHI Headquarters Office Contact:
David Evans
ISA Team Leader
2620 Low Dutch Road
Gettysburg, PA 17325
Tel: 717-337-2538 Fax: 717-337-3520
Email: devans@fhi.net**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	BACKGROUND	1
2.	PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW	2
3.	EXISTING PERFORMANCE INFORMATION SOURCES	3
4.	REVIEW QUESTIONS	4
5.	REVIEW METHODOLOGY	5
6.	REVIEW TEAM COMPOSITION	6
7.	TIMEFRAME	7
8.	REPORTING	7
9.	BUDGET	8

1. BACKGROUND

Food for the Hungry International (FHI) has been implementing Title II food security programs in Africa and Latin America since 1985. Despite that long history and contrary to many other cooperating sponsors who have been receiving ISG/As since the beginning, FHI received its first institutional support grant in 1997. The grant period for that ISG was 20 months with the goal being to achieve significant impact in food security via the establishment of a robust monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system in FHI's Title II programs. The focus of the ISG activities was to design and develop methodologies and systems, and train and provide technical assistance to FHI Title II-related field staff in the following components of the food security M&E continuum: 1) macro-targeting, 2) micro-targeting, 3) indicator development, 4) baseline data collection and analysis, 5) monitoring, and 6) evaluation. FHI met all and surpassed many of its targets that it set for the ISG outputs and activities.

As a follow-on to the ISG, FHI is currently implementing a five-year ISA program that began in September 1998 and is scheduled to end in August 2003. The program is addressing six major headquarters' and field priority areas:

- 1) program design and implementation of development programs,
- 2) emergency and transition programs,
- 3) new country program initiation,
- 4) commodity management,
- 5) collaborative efforts in M&E, monetization and local partner facilitation, and
- 6) information systems.

The goal of the ISA activities is to increase the impact of FHI's Title II food security programs via the improvement of its technical, programmatic and managerial capability. This is being accomplished by way of the following objectives:

- A. Select, promote and train staff in the use of standard, high-quality tools for Title II program design and implementation as a follow up to the accomplishments achieved under the former ISG program in M&E system standardization;
- B. Improve FHI's capacity to respond to emergencies and facilitate a rapid transition to development activities in Sub-Saharan Africa;
- C. Conduct needs assessments in Mali/Burkina Faso and Haiti to determine rationale for and feasibility of initiating activities in those countries;
- D. Improve FHI's capacity to efficiently and effectively manage commodities;
- E. Collectively improve a) program monitoring and evaluation, b) monetization activities and Bellmon analyses, and c) local capacity building via substantive collaborative efforts with other Title II cooperating sponsors; and

- F. Via a mentoring agreement, contribute toward the improvement of FAM knowledge of and proficiency in using information technology to enhance communication and information flow between the PVO members of FAM.

FHI's ISA program is targeted to impact three distinct sets of beneficiaries in the following order of importance: 1) current FHI Title II programs in Bolivia, Ethiopia, Kenya and Mozambique, 2) potential future FHI Title II programs, and 3) other FAM-member Title II Cooperating Sponsors. The program is implemented by a five-member, multi-disciplinary team composed of 1) a team leader (who also serve as the technical assistant in agriculture and training facilitator), 2) a technical assistant and trainer in maternal-child health and nutrition, 3) a technical assistant and trainer in commodity management, 4) a technical assistant and trainer in information systems, and 5) a technical assistant and trainer in emergency response programming. In addition, FAM staff and other Title II Cooperating Sponsors provide indirect support to the program via the collaborative efforts described above in objective E.

FHI is now entering the third year of its ISA program having accomplished the great majority of its activity and output objectives for years one and two. That said, it is critical at this juncture to conduct a more detailed review of the program in order to more fully assess progress in meeting planned objectives in activities and outputs as well as trends in effects and impact. This review will provide us with critical information in order to refine program activities and targets for the remainder of the agreement period.

2. PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW

USAID/BHR/FFP's stated purpose of the mid-term review is the following:

“to assess progress in achieving planned results and refine program activities and targets accordingly. Specifically, mid-term data, including qualitative and quantitative information, should be used to:

- determine progress towards achieving targets;
- refine targets if needed;
- review the appropriateness of the activity with respect to the problem analysis in the ISA and any subsequent amendments;
- identify constraints and difficulties as well as successes; and
- make recommendations to improve the performance, or, as appropriate, suggest modifications or discontinuance of activities.

In terms of technical review criteria, midterms will be assessed on the following points:

- status of all monitoring indicators (targets in terms of planned/achieved);
- status of impact indicators (those designed to be assessed at mid-term, and those whose effect should be discernible in terms of overall program results);
- realistic appraisal based on indicator review of likelihood of achieving all targets;
- concrete recommendations for modifications to agreement's objectives or overall performance;
- any changes to the M&E plan with respect to targets and indicators;
- results from any assessments, surveys or other data collection procedures used in the course of the mid-term review; and
- inclusion of an updated Indicator Performance Tracking Table."

FHI concurs with the above purposes outlined by USAID.

3. EXISTING PERFORMANCE INFORMATION SOURCES

In order for the review team to successfully conduct the mid-term review, they will need to conduct a thorough review of existing ISG/ISA documentation. The following list of documents is comprehensive, but not necessarily exhaustive. All of these documents can be obtained from or through FHI's ISA team leader.

- FHI's corporate identity (including vision of community);
- 1997-98 ISG final proposal;
- Quarterly and final reports for the ISG;
- 1999-2003 ISA final proposal;
- ISA program performance M&E plan;
- 2000 and 2001 ISA annual work plans;
- 1999 and 2000 annual results reports;
- Food security extranet website;
- ISA team orientation notes;
- Mali/Burkina Faso and Haiti food security needs assessments;
- Title II commodity management procedures manual;
- Educational messages and methods assessment report;
- Workshop notes and handouts for the following ISA workshops: M&E remedial; Food security problem analysis and program design; Food security education

messages and methods; Emergency program preparation; Rapid disaster assessments; Emergency program design; and Commodity management procedures – part 1.

- Pre/post test scores for the workshops above;
- Participant evaluation summaries of the workshops above;
- Quality improvement checklist scores from Title II fields; and
- FAM annual evaluations of mentoring activities.

4. REVIEW QUESTIONS

Several key questions need to be answered in order to fully review FHI's ISA performance. The questions below should form the bulk of the review. However, it is likely that additional questions will arise as a result of going through the review process. The review team should include these additional questions—and their answers—in the review report.

1. Were the planned first-half objectives achieved for the program? Specifically, were the annual monitoring indicators (activities and outputs) and mid-term evaluation indicators (effects and impacts) successfully reached?
2. What were the most significant constraints and/or difficulties in implementing the program and, where appropriate, how did FHI overcome them? What recommendations does the review team have for overcoming the remaining constraints?
3. Given that a large part of FHI's ISA focuses on capacity building of Title II staff, what has been the change in the related knowledge, skills and practices of those staff?
4. What is the perspective of FHI Title II field staff with regards to the services provided under the ISA?
5. In what ways has the ISA program made a positive impact on FHI's ability to increase food security at the field level?
6. Based on the answers to 1 – 5 above, should any of the program objectives, activities and related indicators be changed for the second half of the grant? If so, which ones? Why should they be changed? How should they be changed?
7. How did the best practices identified in the CS collaborative efforts in M&E, monetization and local capacity building effect FHI's ISA program?
8. What other recommendations does the review team have in order to improve program performance for the second half of the grant period?

5. REVIEW METHODOLOGY

Through participatory methods (see e.g., Participatory Program Evaluation: A manual for involving program stakeholders in the evaluation process, by Judi Aubel), a multi-disciplinary team composed of FHI headquarters and field staff and one external consultant will examine FHI's ISA program approaches and results using both quantitative and qualitative methods. A visit to two Title II fields will allow field staff and beneficiaries to provide their inputs to the review process. The mid-term review will be conducted in three stages:

Stage 1: Review of Existing Documentation
Time Frame: 01 – 10 April 2001

The review team will conduct a thorough review of existing data and information from the documents cited above in Section 3. In addition, the team may decide to consult additional documentation from headquarters office, Title II field offices, or other places. It will also evaluate the FAM mentoring activities and results during this stage. Finally, the team will make preliminary field visit plans.

Stage 2: Refinement of Review Methods
Time Frame: 10 – 30 April 2001

FHI's ISA activities are heavily weighted toward building the capacity of field staff in order to increase their effectiveness in improving food security. In order to determine whether capacity has been built and more importantly that this increased capacity is being used on a routine basis by the trained staff, the team will need to combine both quantitative and qualitative approaches to data collection. Rather than stating the exact mix in this scope of work, we feel that it is crucial for all the review team members to be involved in the method selection process. For some performance indicators, we will attempt to gather statistically valid quantitative data. For other indicators, qualitative methods will be a better way to gather more useful information. In any case, at least the following data collection methods will be utilized: focus group interviews, key informant interviews, document review, observation, random spot checks (visits to field offices and target population homes/fields), and surveys. In addition, decisions will need to be made on choosing a sample of staff and target population to be interviewed/surveyed. Thus, during this stage, the team will decide on the methods and instruments to be used during the field visit and will clear them with USAID/BHR/FFP and/or FANTA. Following approval by USAID, the team will prepare for the data collection exercise in the field.

Stage 3: Field Data Collection
Time Frame: 01 – 15 May 2001

The team will plan and coordinate all the necessary logistics for the qualitative and quantitative collection of data at the field level. Due to budgetary and time

constraints, FHI proposes conducting the field review in only two of the four fields—Ethiopia and Mozambique. The reasons for selecting these fields are: Ethiopia represents a long-term Title II field (began programming in 1985) while Mozambique represents a new program (began in 1997); we believe the change in effect (staff who changed the way they are implementing programs as a result of the ISA training) in Mozambique to be relatively good (especially the health staff), while we believe it to be relatively poor in Ethiopia; the commodity management program in Ethiopia is large and challenging (compared to Bolivia's which had been relatively well run even prior to the ISA); and cost savings due to visits to one continent. The team would spend a maximum of four days in each of these two fields collecting data.

Stage 4: Review Report
Time Frame: 15 May – 15 June 2001

Upon returning to the U.S., the review team will draft a preliminary report with conclusions and recommendations. The team will hold a half-day meeting with FHI ISA staff to present findings and discuss lessons learned and recommendations. The team will incorporate written and oral feedback into preparation of a final report which will be submitted to USAID/BHR/FFP no later than 30 June 2001.

6. REVIEW TEAM COMPOSITION

The mid-term review team will include an external technical consultant who will serve as review facilitator, selected FHI ISA team members, and one FHI Title II field staff. The mid-term evaluation will be conducted over a ten-week period at an estimated cost of \$32,950.

The mid-term review team will be composed of:

1. Team Facilitator

The team facilitator will be an external technical consultant who is responsible for coordinating all review activities, coordinating the efforts of the other team members, meeting the specified objectives, collaborating with USAID and/or FANTA, and leading the writing of the reports according to the defined timeline.

2. Two FHI ISA team members (from headquarters)

The ISA team leader will serve as one of the two FHI headquarters team members. The other member will be either the technical assistant and trainer in commodity management or the TA and trainer in information systems.

3. One FHI Title II field staff (from one of the four Title II field countries)

One representative from FHI Title II field countries will serve as the fourth and final team member. This field staff will be from either Bolivia or Kenya in order to provide an external perspective to the two countries being visited (Ethiopia and Mozambique).

7. TIMEFRAME

Stage 1: Review of Existing Documentation -- Time Frame: 01 – 10 April 2001
Total Person/Days = 12 (3 days x 4 team members)

Stage 2: Refinement of Review Methods -- Time Frame: 10 – 30 April 2001
Total Person/Days = 13 (4 days x 3 team members + 1 day x 1 team member)

Stage 3: Field Data Collection -- Time Frame: 01 – 15 May 2001
Total Person/Days = 48 (12 days x 4 team members)

Stage 4: Review Report -- Time Frame: 15 May – 15 June 2001
Total Person/Days = 13 (6 days x 1 team member + 3 days x 2 team members + 1 day x 1 team member)

Total Time Frame: 01 April – 15 June 2001 = 75 days

Total Person/Days = 86 (25 days for team facilitator, 22 days for two ISA team members, and 17 days for field staff team member)

8. REPORTING

The final report must be submitted to USAID/BHR/COTR on or before 30 June 2001. The report must contain at least the following sections. Additional sections may be recommended by the review team.

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. Methodology
4. Updated Indicator Performance Tracking Table
5. Discussion of Performance Results
6. Lessons Learned
7. Recommendations for Out Years of ISA